
Vol. XIII No. 1

Fall 1990

Creation

Social Science

and Humanities

QUARTERLY



CREATION SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES SOCIETY

The Creation Social Science and Humanities Society (CSSHS) was incorporated in Wichita, Kansas, in 1977. The CSSHS is educational, and will promote and disseminate information on the implications of the Biblical creation model of origins for the social sciences and humanities, with emphasis on the development of these disciplines in accordance with the rapidly emerging and increasingly well established natural scientific models of Biblical creation.

The **Quarterly Journal** is directed toward teachers and students of the social sciences and humanities, especially in institutions of higher learning. The CSSHS may also publish books, monographs, and other writings, and sponsor speakers, seminars, and research projects related to its educational purpose.

IRS tax-exempt status was granted December 30, 1977. All contributions are tax-deductible.

Voting membership is initially by invitation of the Board of Directors of CSSHS to candidates eligible on the following basis.

a. persons with at least a baccalaureate degree in the social sciences or humanities; or

b. persons 18 years old or over, who have held office in another creation-science organization with beliefs, substantially identical with those contained in the CSSHS **Statement of Belief**, for at least one year immediately prior to applying for membership in the CSSHS; or who have a commitment to our belief and work clearly evidenced by their record of actual involvement. Voting membership dues are \$12 (foreign, \$13 U.S.) per year.

Sustaining membership is open to those who subscribe to the C.S.S.H.S. Statement of Belief. Sustaining membership dues are \$12 (foreign, \$13 U.S.) per year.

Both voting and sustaining memberships include subscription to the **CSSH Quarterly**, and are reckoned as beginning and ending in September.

Non-members may subscribe to the **CSSH Quarterly** at the rate of \$14 (foreign, \$15 U.S.) per year.

Officers: Dr. Paul D. Ackerman, *President*; Mrs. Diane Powell, *Vice-President*; Mrs. Ellen Myers, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

Editor: Dr. Paul D. Ackerman.

Board of Reference: Dr. Duane T. Gish, *San Diego, California*; Rev. Walter Lang, *Minneapolis Minnesota*; Dr. Henry M. Morris, *San Diego, California*; Dr. Harold S. Slusher, *El Paso, Texas*; Dr. John C. Whitcomb, Jr., *Winona Lake, Indiana*; Dr. Clifford A. Wilson, *Mt. Waverly, Victoria, Australia*.

ISSN 0740-3399

Devotional

GOD'S ANSWER TO DISCOURAGEMENT

J. Dwight Pentecost

Every one of us, at one time or another, has said, "I've lost my hope, and I don't see how I can go on." It could happen at the loss of a loved one, the deterioration of our health, or betrayal by a friend. At these times, we are discouraged and despairing. We are ready to quit. At this point we have a choice—to get better or to get bitter.

The man who is discouraged has lost heart and the will to fight. If he gives in he is defeated.

When Satan wants to gain victory over a believer, or when Satan would keep a believer from fighting the good fight of faith, he does not have to throw an unconquerable foe against him. All he has to do is change the believer's attitude toward victory. When a believer is convinced that victory is no longer possible, he is defeated. But what does the Bible say on this subject? "With God all things are possible," Matt. 19:26.

Discouragement is principally self-occupation. A person becomes discouraged by turning his eyes inward upon himself and evaluating things in terms of himself. He sees every situation only in the light of how it affects him personally. Becoming occupied with himself, therefore, he is easily discouraged because he knows he is inadequate for any situation. As soon as a believer is no longer occupied with Jesus Christ but with himself, he is ready prey to discouragement.

When it seems that the circumstances of life threaten to engulf us, we become occupied with what we are going through. We forget that we are in the hand of Christ. In that relationship we are doubly secure and safe. We forget that God has a purpose for His child that involves every detail in his life. We forget that God is conforming us to Jesus Christ and has selected just the things for us to experience in order that the image of Christ might be revealed in us. When we forget the purpose, the power and the program of God, we become occupied with the methods that God uses to accomplish His purposes. That is when we become defeated and discouraged.

Look away from yourself and look to the Lord Jesus Christ. He is the One Who removes faintness of heart and gives valor for the battle. Look to Him, and you will be encouraged.

CSSH Quarterly
Vol. XIII, No. 1 (Fall 1990)

LETTER

Dear Editor,

In the Winter 1988 *CSSHQ* you have a letter from Mr. Magnus Verbrugge who states that he never knew a humanist converted by creation science arguments. Well, I am one. I attended Washington State University from 1973 to 1977 with degrees in business and economics, plus graduate work at other universities.

I always wanted to be a scientist but was turned off by evolution. In my senior year I attended a lecture by Dr. Duane Gish from the Institute for Creation Research at the University of Idaho. That lecture turned my life around. It was too late to get a degree in biology or botany since I was already a senior in economics and business. However, I spent six years as a laboratory researcher at the University of Washington Medical School part time, so I feel I am a scientist since I worked with undergraduates and graduates in the lab, and did basic research in science areas. So in me Mr. Verbrugge has at least one scientist who was converted from humanism to Christianity by facts of creation science. And I was a humanist indeed: I used to go to Bible studies on campus and disrupt them with tough questions the Bible study leaders often could not answer. I am friends with a Ph.D. in microbiology who was converted as I was by the awful fact that evolution was not the answer we were taught it was in college. Rather it was a crock of garbage that had major holes in it.

As to false claims that creationists use presuppositions and were not there at creation to get to the nitty gritty, a lot of philosophers and scientists, if pushed to the limit, will admit that they cannot even prove their current existence on earth this very moment. To exist on earth requires presuppositions. If you drink water which you need to exist you presuppose that you exist on earth, you need water to live, that the water is not poisonous, etc. Descartes the philosopher said, "I think, therefore I am," only he forgot that he made a presupposition that he thought, thereby destroying his whole system of philosophy. My main point is that everybody has presuppositions; neither creationists nor evolutionists were present at the beginning of the world, but both have presuppositions to carry out their daily lives.

Creation scientists have many things in common with evolutionists, therefore you take the common ground of science and debate the merits of an hypothesis. The problem is that you run into people (and they are legion) who listen patiently and say you make sense with your creation arguments, then

say "I understand and believe you are right, but I am not willing to change my viewpoints on being an evolutionist." Now it is a form of mental illness to deny reality and to live in a false island of illusion. Second, it is a type of faith, which many have spent years in universities to acquire, have written thesis papers, have received accolades, have written books and received money. To change this faith is tough if not impossible. Yes, it is faith, misplaced faith, but faith none the less.

Lastly, evolution is being challenged by the younger generation of scientists, and New Age and Eastern religions are fast filling the void, so we need to be prepared to defend the faith in knowledge and humility.

Very sincerely yours,

John F. Flanagan
13608 121st Avenue N.E.
Kirkland, WA 98034

MISSION TO MOSCOW 1990: THE GROUNDWORK

The lead article "ICR Scientist Visits Russia" of the July 1990 *Acts and Facts*, news bulletin of the Institute for Creation Research, San Diego, California, reported on the May 1990 creation-science "mission to Moscow" of Dr. Duane Gish, ICR's Vice-President. By God's providence this writer was significantly involved in the groundwork leading up to Dr. Gish's greatly successful trip.

Already for many years I had been writing to and praying for Christian prisoners for the faith in the Soviet Union. One of these prisoners was the Russian Orthodox Christian Aleksandr Ogorodnikov. Upon the advent of "perestroika" and "glasnost" he was released from prison in 1988 and recommenced publishing of the *Bulletin of Christian Community*, one of the better known Russian Christian publications distributed privately in the Soviet Union and abroad. Before Christmas 1988 the names of seventeen brave Christians in the Soviet Union who wished to correspond with Christians in the West were announced by CREED (Dr. Ernest Gordon, President, 787 Princeton Kingston Road, Princeton, NJ 08540, phone 609-497-0224). The list included Ogorodnikov. I wrote to all 17; the first reply I received was from him. We continued to correspond (I read, write and speak Russian), and we sent him copies of the *CSSH Quarterly* and

CSSH Quarterly
Vol. XIII, No. 1 (Fall 1990)

other materials.

In August 1989 Ogorodnikov wrote me that he would be allowed to visit with Western Christians on October 15, 1989 in Brussels, Belgium, where he had friends publishing his Christian writings. He wondered whether I could attend this meeting. I could not, but contacted members and subscribers to the *CSSH Quarterly* in Europe, including M. Dominique Tassot, President of the *Cercle Scientifique et Historique (CESHE)*, a Catholic organization standing for the inerrancy of Scripture including, of course, creation. M. Tassot was able to attend the Brussels meeting with Mr. Ogorodnikov. He also is fluent in Russian and had been burdened like myself for Christians in the Soviet Union.

Upon his return M. Tassot wrote me that he had spoken to Ogorodnikov about creationism, and that Ogorodnikov had "immediately understood the interest of the creationist theses for Christian thought, particularly in an officially atheist country. ... Ogorodnikov has decided to promote our thesis of the historical and scientific veracity of the Bible and asks for our help in two ways: (1) send articles or books, if possible translated, on creationism in the widest sense; and (2) *participation of western speakers in his theological 'seminar' in Moscow*. It was decided to begin these conferences next spring (1990)."

M. Tassot asked me to contact ICR so ICR might send a speaker to Moscow for this conference in the spring of 1990, leaving the choice of the speaker to me. He also asked me to come myself if at all possible as I know Russian. He himself and M. Guy Berthault, also of CESHE, a geologist and the author of an important study on sedimentology, also planned to come to Moscow.

Early the next morning after I received M. Tassot's letter a dear Christian friend called me with the message that the Lord had put it on the family's heart to make money available to me for His special work and purpose. I told my friend of the possible creation mission trip to Russia. I myself knew beyond doubt that our Lord wanted Dr. Duane Gish to be the speaker from ICR; now the funds, too, were available. I immediately wrote to Dr. Gish, stating that "I see this as our Lord's 'Macedonian Call' to you at this extraordinary time, when there is an open door to the Soviet Union which has not existed for over 70 years." On December 5, 1989 Dr. Gish telephoned me to let me know he and Mrs. Gish would go. Shortly afterwards the date for the trip was fixed for May 20-30, 1990. The help of Mr. Eugene Grosman, a native Russian speaker working with the Slavic Gospel Association, was enlisted by Dr. Gish. Contacts for setting up conferences, debates and so on in Moscow were also made through Dr. Dmitri Kuznetsov, whose strong Christian and creation science witness has been described in earlier issues of *Acts and*

Facts.

As it turned out in the end, the conference with Mr. Ogorodnikov was the least attended of all events featuring Dr. Gish, because Ogorodnikov had meanwhile been dismissed as editor of the *Bulletin of Christian Community* due to Soviet KGB slander. ICR had hoped to bring in creationist books, but this did not happen. On the other hand, creationist films by Films for Christ are being shown on Soviet television now, and Dr. Gish's own trip was an unqualified great success. He told me after his return that "there was no carping criticism of any kind" or at any time of his creationist message. What a surprising contrast to the treatment of this message in "free, Christian" America!

However, it is still by no means without danger to be an outspoken Christian of leadership ability in Gorbachev's realm. I have not had direct personal news from Ogorodnikov since he wrote me in August 1989, though I have remained in close touch with other less "visible" Russian Christians. CREED believes that to cooperate with Ogorodnikov is to invite KGB murder; Ogorodnikov has lost a brother and a close personal friend and collaborator to staged "accidents." I myself did not receive a visa to enter the Soviet Union (supposedly because the Intourist bureau "could not guarantee a room"), nor did M. Tassot. We are both convinced that we were not allowed to go in because of our previous efforts in behalf of Russian Christians in prison.

Nevertheless the groundwork for the first creationist "mission to Moscow" was laid by our Lord many years in advance. It began at least at the time when He called Aleksandr Ogorodnikov into His service and martyrdom; when He enabled me to learn Russian when still a child in Germany; when He burdened the hearts of Dominique Tassot and myself for our Christian brothers and sisters under Communist persecution; when He brought the Creation Social Science and Humanities Society and its Quarterly into being in 1977; when He converted the heart of Dmitri Kuznetsov to Himself and then taught him the good news of Creation through ICR; when He gave more freedom to Russian Christians through Gorbachev as His instrument; and finally, when He directly established the contacts through myself and Dominique Tassot which led to Dr. Gish's trip. Our Lord also last but not least burdened many Christian brothers and sisters to pray for us all. (I also personally praise Him for not sending me to Moscow in His all-knowing good and perfect will, for my presence was urgently needed here due to an unforeseen crisis in my family. Our Lord doeth all things well!) May all praise and glory for all this be to Him only, our sovereign, faithful Creator!

Ellen Myers

ANNOUNCEMENT

DEVOTIONAL "CREATION AND WORSHIP" AVAILABLE IN TRACT FORM

Pursuant to the suggestion of one of our faithful members, the devotional by Ellen Myers "Creation and Worship" in Vol. XII, No. 4 (Summer 1990) of the *Creation Social Science and Humanities Quarterly* is now available in tract or church bulletin form. Contact us for further information.

FORERUNNER OF NEW AGE MADNESS: A CRITIQUE OF NORMAN O. BROWN

Ellen Myers

When revolutionary unrest stirred up college students in America and Western Europe during the 1960s, Norman O. Brown was considered a major social theorist by the young rebels against the "establishment."¹ Born in 1913, he was educated at Oxford, the University of Chicago and the University of Wisconsin. During World War II he taught languages at Nebraska Wesleyan University and served for three years in the Office of Strategic Services. He then taught classics and comparative literature at Wesleyan University, the University of Rochester, and finally at the University of California at Santa Cruz. His two books which made him famous as a revolutionary thinker and are still influential in academic circles are *Life Against Death* (1959) and *Love's Body* (1966).

Brown's message is an intellectual witches' brew of Freudianism, his own brand of wildly heterodox "Dionysian" Christianity, and big doses of Zen Buddhism. He calls for the abolition of all distinctions and boundaries in a united universe of mad chaos:

The body to be realized is the body of the cosmic man, the body of the universe as one perfect man. ... As in schizophrenia: "What happens to the person's own body ... is identical with what happens in the universe. ... Freedom is fire, overcoming this world by reducing it to a fluctuating chaos, as in schizophrenia; the chaos which is the eternal ground of creation."²

This passage along with many others anticipates the New Age terminology of the 1980s. The goal, cosmic oneness, is the same as well.

Because the Bible teaches creation out of nothing (not out of chaos) by a sovereign, transcendent and personal God who is not one with but other than his creation, it cannot be reconciled with Brown's identification of the self with the universe. Brown's frequent quotes from the Bible and occasional references to orthodox Christian thinkers must hence always

be suspect as deliberately and perversely taken out of context. As is to be expected, Brown opposes "literalism" in the interpretation of Scripture. His notion of "truth" is radically unbiblical and irrational: "The mad truth: the boundary between sanity and insanity is a false one. The proper outcome of psychoanalysis is the abolition of the boundary." Then Matthew 10:39 is misquoted in support.³ Brown also asserts that "The real world ... is the world where thoughts are omnipotent, where no distinction is drawn between wish and deed." Then Matthew 5:27-28 is quoted in support of this magic wish-fulfillment world, but Matthew 5:29 containing Christ's warning of hell if sin is not forsaken is omitted.⁴ These and many other examples are consistent with Brown's desire for a Dionysian Christianity, in which the scripture is a dead letter to be made alive by spiritual (symbolical) interpretations; in which meaning is not fixed, but ever new and ever changing "... Meaning is made ... from the Abgrund (abyss), from the unconscious of the reader past the conscious intention of the author to the unconscious meaning; breaking the barrier of the ego and the barrier of the book."⁵

For Brown; man's fall is not disobedience of God's truth and command and acceptance of Satan's lie as taught in the Bible (Genesis 3). Instead "The fall is into language. ... And overcoming the consequences of the fall is speaking with tongues. ... a second fall into the second innocence; verbum infans, the infant or ineffable word."⁶ Brown often uses German and Latin phrases, a technique adding to the incantatory effect of his high-flown pronouncements. He asserts that "To restore to words their full significance ... is to reduce them to nonsense. ... Get the nothingness back into words. ... Empty words, corresponding to the void in things."⁷

Brown's running attack against meaningful language is often clothed in sexual symbolism. His notorious idea of "polymorphous perversity" means that each and every part of the body should be used in sexual play, the pornographic practices all around us today. Brown fully supports Freud's postulate of the unconscious, from which man's innermost instincts and desires allegedly arise. While Freud still believed that some of these desires and drives needed to be suppressed or sublimated (transformed into socially useful endeavors), Brown would impose no such restrictions and approves of them all. This is in total opposition to the words of Jesus Christ: "From within, out of the heart of man, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness: all these evil things come from within, and defile the man (Mark 7:21-23)." Christ clearly makes a difference between evil and good, defilement and cleanness. Brown wants to confound

them utterly:

Overthrow the importance principle: turn it upside down. Put down the mighty from their seats, and exalt them of low degree (another perverted quote from Scripture, in this instance the prayer of Mary the mother of our Lord in Luke 1:52). Every throne a toilet seat, and every toilet seat a throne. ... the distinction between the sublime and the vulgar is abolished ... As above, so below (this is the motto of occultism and sorcery) ... The way up is the way down; the penis a symbolic head, and vice versa.⁸

Here is another typical example of Brown's call to madness perversely using biblical terminology including the name of Christ Himself:

The Pentecostal darkness: the sun shall be turned to darkness. To overcome the opposition of darkness and light, cleanliness and dirt, order and chaos; the marriage of heaven and hell (a concept borrowed from the heterodox mystic William Blake). To seduce the world to madness. Christ is within the wall of paradise, which is the wall of the law of contradiction, and the destruction of the law of contradiction is the supreme task of higher logic.⁹

Brown claims that the life instinct, called "Eros" by Freud, urges men to unification with each other and the universe, while the death instinct, Freud's "Thanatos," separates or divides. We must therefore "construct an erotic sense of reality. (To do so is) to become conscious of symbolism. Symbolism is mind making connections (correspondences) rather than distinctions (separations)."¹⁰ Now symbolism is an integral part of traditional language as "a figure of speech" or "metaphor." Thus it makes perfect sense in traditional language to say that old age is to life as evening is to day, and therefore to speak of old age as "life's evening" or life's "sunset." Symbolism used in this manner, that is properly in conformity with created reality, may indeed provide great insights, joys and aesthetic pleasure, and it is a powerful tool of lawful human creativity. As Kathy Lynn Hutson has ably stated it,

In both the creation and evolution models (of the origin of man and language) ... man is dependent on metaphoric activity ... The difference in the models is the nature of that foundation. In evolution that word-foundation consists of arbitrary human sounds with no verifiable correspondence with the true nature of things. In the creation model, the base is the audible (not mystical) spoken words of God to man.¹¹

Brown adheres to the evolution model of origins and therefore sees nothing wrong with words as "arbitrary human sounds with

no verifiable correspondence with the true nature of things." On the contrary, he deliberately uses symbolism to confound concrete and logical opposites: birth is death, male is female, the son is the father, the hero is the scapegoat, the criminal is the victim, human creativity is human excrement (the theme of two important and lengthy sections in *Life Against Death*), and so on. As in Freud, sexual symbolism is used indiscriminately everywhere.

The Freudian Marxist Herbert Marcuse, who also greatly influenced the young revolutionaries of the 1960s, parts company with Brown over his use of symbolism when it comes to social and political action:

Revolution, freedom, fulfillment in turn become symbolic—symbolic goals and events. Symbolic of what? The answer remains, must remain, shrouded in mystery, because Brown envisions an Absolute, a Totality, a Whole which swallows up all parts, and divisions, all tensions and all needs, that is to say, all life.¹²

Marcuse senses the reductionism which underlies Brown's monism and robs it of all value. Brown in turn frequently distances himself from Marxism and is determinedly apolitical in his condemnation of all human action as nothing but satanic and "excrement." Of course his rejection of all social and political action also extends to Western free enterprise capitalism. Many leftist and anarchist pronouncements may be gleaned from his writings (for instance, the final chapter, "Filthy Lucre," of *Life Against Death*). There is a difference here between Christianity, Marxism and Brown: Christianity agrees that Western free enterprise capitalism is not perfect due to man's sinfulness after the fall, but it does not condemn free enterprise as such. On the contrary, it recognizes that man's biblical creation mandate (Genesis 1:28) is to each individual man and woman and very much includes economic creativity and stewardship under God. Marxism denies God, blames free enterprise ("private property") for all man's economic and social ills, and asserts that these can be cured only by the abolition of private enterprise and decision-making in a communist totalitarian state. The failure of this view ought to be clear to everyone from the dismal record of communist societies through history, especially since 1917. Brown denies both God and human action, reducing both to nothing.

Brown's peculiar style, especially in *Love's Body*, is reminiscent of Nietzsche and the turgid writings of New Age "saint" Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, and hence very difficult to understand. Theodore Roszak, himself a leading "New Age" thinker, cannot help commenting that

Love's Body ... is, I feel, a silly-brilliant effort ... Brown has tried to discover a language beyond language,

unrestricted by ... logicity, continuity, or even normal sentence structure. The result is a witch's caldron of puns, rhymes, etymological prestidigitation, and oracular outpouring. ... which could mean, at too many points, everything and nothing.¹³

Brown would counter that his entire work is designed to undermine reliance upon human reason. Unlike Brown, Christians consider human reason when submitted to God's lordship and revealed knowledge and wisdom to be capable of great contributions to man's welfare. Brown would discard reason altogether because it is contrary to his irrational view of the self as equal to or absorbing the universe.

In Brown's monistic and even solipsist view of the world as equal to the self, "love" can only be love of self. His "love" is a thoroughgoing narcissism. This is a total perversion of Christ's summary of God's law—to "love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind ... and thy neighbor as thyself" (Matthew 22:37, 39). For Brown God and neighbor are "thyself." For Christians love is already rooted ontologically in the Godhead as Trinity, three Persons in One Godhead. Brown denies the biblical Christian doctrine of the Trinity as well as human personality and individuality. For him, "person" and "individuality" are masks donned under social pressure, and the true "trinity" is the "primal scene" of the father in the act of begetting the embryo in the mother.¹⁴

While Marcuse perceived the sterility of Brown's monism in practical social action, he overlooked the overall failure of Freudianism in helping supposedly "neurotic" people adjust to society. If adjustment to reality/society is the goal of Freudian psychotherapy, then it clearly does not justify its enormous cost in terms of finance and time.¹⁵ Freud himself was pessimistic about achieving lasting benefits for society through psychoanalysis because he believed that "Eros," the alleged life-giving or pleasure-seeking instinct in man, was not strong enough to overcome or perhaps actually served "Thanatos," the death instinct.¹⁶ But Brown, as we already saw, is not at all interested in producing mental health defined as adjustment to the "reality principle" in the form of society. On the contrary, he calls man's normal mental state or common, reality-oriented sense a "prejudice" and asserts that "The proper posture is to listen to and learn from lunatics (because) ... The insane do not share 'the normal prejudice in favor of external reality.'"¹⁷

The most striking features of Brown's call for cosmic merger with the self by madness, however, are shared with Zen Buddhism. Brown's idea of making "every throne a toilet seat," that is, the abolition of all respect for authority, echoes Zen Buddhist master Linchi's vehement command to his disciples to "Smash whatever you come across ... the buddha, Patriarchs ... your

parents and all your relations ..."¹⁸ This revolt against authority certainly appealed to the revolutionaries and hippies in the 1960s and 70s, some of whom are now teaching in American and West European universities and colleges. Brown's attack upon a literal interpretation of the Bible resembles Zen Buddhist convert, spokesman and erstwhile Episcopal priest Alan Watts' statement that "Godmanhood is to be discovered here and now inwardly, not in the letter of the Bible."¹⁹

A crucial likeness between Zen and Brown is the "turning to inwardness," the very definition and essence of Zen. Lit-sen Chang, a Christian convert from Zen, writes:

This turning to "inwardness" has been the mainspring of all philosophy down through the ages in India. According to the Upanishads, to know "Other is self" ("other" is but the objectification of the self) is the ultimate wisdom or the highest joy. If one could comprehend "Tat Tvam Asi" (a phrase quoted repeatedly by Brown) ... (which means "that thou art" or "the other is yourself," "the eternal is oneself," "thou art the Eternal"), he is delivered from bondage to freedom.²⁰

Zen Buddhism anticipates Brown's goal of insanity as it is "a technique by which to achieve a mental breakdown" and "a piling up intellectual frustrations that lead to the crumbling of the edifice of logical thought."²¹ Zen is "a revolt against reason, a breaking down of the mere intellectual images of the living reality knowable only by personal experience."²² Again, this precept is fundamental also to Brown's "Dionysian Christianity."

Brown's use of perverse symbolism is also present in Zen. One Zen adept quoted his teacher as saying that "the practice of Zen is to be described as the gold and ordure method. Before it is comprehended, it is all like gold; after it is comprehended, it is all like ordure."²³ Freud, too, spoke in this manner of his own teaching, writing to a friend, "I can hardly tell you how many things I—a new Midas—turn into filth."²⁴ Faithful to his mentors, Brown teaches that all human action and creativity is "excrement."

Freudians including Brown postulate a collective unconscious directing man. Zen teaches this as well:

In Zen, will is more basic than the intellect because it is the principle that lies at the root of all existences and unites them all in the oneness of being. The one great will from which all infinitely varied wills flow is "Cosmic Unconscious," which is the Zen's reservoir of infinite possibilities.²⁵

Brown would abolish all "repressions" imposed upon man's desires. Zen does the same, declaring that "to avoid sin and evil by obedience to any moral law is only an idle attempt. Every being must act according to the Nature."²⁶ For Brown as

well as for Zen there is no distinction between good and evil: "Zen admonishes one not only to love God but also to love 'devils'; ... a clinging to the 'one true God,' the 'one true religion,' the 'one true principle,' is condemned as 'narrow limitation.'"²⁷ Due to their coercive disciplines, their perversion and willful ignorance of rationality and reality, and their assertion of magical omnipotence, "many Zen masters in China got very odd qualities and are called 'Mo-wong' (literally means 'demon-king') which proves that they have become mentally deranged."²⁸

As Marcuse recognized, Brown's mad monism is powerless to bring about political and social improvement. This is also true of Zen and Buddhism in general. Ernest Becker in his *Zen: A Rational Critique* (New York: Norton, 1961) writes that Zen is entirely "impotent to do something tangible to aid suffering humanity, judging by the cities and slums and rural misery of Asia."²⁹ The American scholar Thomas Molnar visited Benares, the holy Hindu city where tens of thousands go annually for ritual cleansing in the Ganges River. Molnar, a world traveler familiar with poverty in urban slums around the globe, was appalled:

Benares dwarfs everything else I have seen. ... It is not "underdevelopment" which creates the horror, the revulsion, the stench; it is, when all is said and done, the religion, which tolerates this indescribable squalor, filth, degradation, and animality. ...

The dirty green river becomes bathroom, toilet, mouthwash, laundromat, drinking place for animal and man. Fully or half-immersed, people wash their hair, their underwear, rinse their mouths, and defecate, as the freely floating dung testifies. All this with the utmost matter-of-factness, without embarrassment. ... But the burning corpses in the busy mid-morning along the banks of the Ganges are enough to turn your stomach. ... It's the utter degradation of the scene: the squalor, defecation, hashish, the pus-filled wounds on the backs of the holy men ... temples where a sweetish stench dominates—all that, plus the dead. ...

Hippies are drawn to this witches' brew ... from Scandinavia, Holland, America and elsewhere. ... What attracts and keeps them here is the degradation: of reason, of self-esteem, of vital forces, of faith in God and man. Here ... everybody may do his thing just like the monkeys and the cows ... Intelligence and purposefulness dissolve on the trashheap, the body rots until it becomes one with the road, the grass, the dung. The great nothingness envelops all, and the ashes go into the river.³⁰

Molnar's concluding reference to the "great nothingness" at the end of all things parallels the last chapter, "Nothing," in Brown's *Love's Body*. Brown's ultimate counsel comes straight from Zen: "Accept loss forever. To lose one's own soul. 'Satori, when the ego is broken, is not final victory but final defeat, the becoming like nothing.'"³¹

To reduce man to nothingness is Brown's "solution" to man's deepest problem, namely, his own existence. For Brown, as for Freud, "man's superiority over the other animals is his capacity for neurosis, and ... Neurosis is an essential consequence of civilization or culture."³² Consistent with Brown's evolutionist faith man is but "another animal," not the unique creature made by God in His own image and likeness with dominion over the earth, as recorded in Genesis 1. Likewise, adherents of Zen "blame God that 'the real human tragedy began when nature was to be dominated by man (cf. Gen. 1:28) for when the idea of power, which is domination, comes in, all kinds of struggles arise.'"³³ Of course Zen, just as Freud and Brown, denies the biblical doctrine of the fall to which Christians attribute the struggles, disasters and pains in this present world. Christians look forward to the restoration of human creativity to the perfection of man's original pure likeness to God in Christ. For the believer this restoration already begins in this life. Brown, however, sees human creativity as producing "neurosis" in man the diseased animal and would therefore eradicate it altogether.

To the extent that the biblical Christian faith in the Triune God and Creator of Scripture has vanished in the West, the conditions Molnar reports from Benares now also prevail here. Descent into filth, degradation and self-destruction marked the drug culture of the 1960s, which aspired to Zen-type "enlightenment" by the psychedelic shortcut. In its consciousness-altering aspects this "enlightenment" resembles outright madness or schizophrenia, which Brown exalts as the right way of life. Schizophrenia is a true clinical illness whose physical causes are still little understood. It consists in the general breakdown of the thinking process. The patient begins to hear voices telling him to jump in front of a speeding automobile. He may see imaginary spirits. He may believe that his thoughts are not his own but produced by computers or radios. A schizophrenic's symptoms may

barely allow him to exist in his own room. ... He cannot easily solve the problems of ordinary living. Many schizophrenics can't even shop for groceries. Sometimes, when a schizophrenic is in a period of recovery, and life deals him a bad turn ... the stress may lead to all his symptoms returning in full force. He then suffers a schizophrenic episode. He may not keep himself clean;

he may wander the streets, talking to himself, shouting at others. Researchers estimate that schizophrenia afflicts half of all the homeless living in the streets.³⁴

To anyone aware of these facts or personally acquainted with a schizophrenic, Brown's idea that schizophrenia should be in any sense a model for normal human behavior is ludicrous. Yet it is precisely the schizophrenic's loss of reality perception and confounding the self with the other-than-self which Brown knows and recommends. He does so because "Schizophrenics pass beyond ordinary language (the language of the reality-principle) into a truer, more symbolic language" and "attain the mad truth." Brown even asserts that to hospitalize schizophrenics is a device to sustain the "normal prejudice in favor of external reality" and to "insulat(e) the so-called reality-principle from all evidence to the contrary."³⁵ Brown's hatred of reality may seem absurd or even ridiculous to the average reader, yet this very teaching won him support among the young rebels and dropouts of the 1960s and continues to maintain his influence on college campuses today as part of the overall "New Age" trend.

Young people may be attracted to Brown's "Dionysian Christianity" or New Ageism in general because it seems "new" and alive compared to the materialism, rationalism and careerism of conventional Western society, and perhaps "dead orthodoxy" in some Christian circles. If so, they are hungry and thirsty for the Living God. Christian evangelism must be based on biblical creation. Only then can it rejoice because God's created reality, even in its present fallen state, reflects the wonder, dynamic life and awesome character of our Lord (Romans 1:18ff.). Because God created it, reality is not an illusion but is truly there and other than ourselves. There is then ample room and joyful challenge for man to exercise his reason, creativity, physical effort, intelligence, charity and playfulness under God; indeed this is the very dominion mandate God entrusted to man at creation (Genesis 1:28)! The rest of God's created world "also will be delivered into the glorious liberty of the children of God" (Romans 8:23). Ahead of us is not the void but the promise of eternal life in God's world created and redeemed by Jesus Christ. Proclaiming this good news in word and consistent life is our urgent joy and duty today. "Woe to us if we do not preach the gospel" to our lost, seduced and dying generation.

¹Theodore Roszak, *The Making of a Counter Culture* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1969), p.84.

²Norman O. Brown, *Love's Body* (New York: Random House Vintage Books, 1966), p.226, p.248.

- ³ibid., pp.160, 161.
- ⁴ibid., p.151.
- ⁵ibid., p.196.
- ⁶ibid., p.257. See also Norman O. Brown, *Life Against Death* (Middleton, CN: Wesleyan University Press, Second Edition, 1985), p.270.
- ⁷Brown, *Love's Body*, pp.258, 259.
- ⁸ibid., p.236.
- ⁹ibid., p.242.
- ¹⁰ibid., p.81.
- ¹¹Kathy Lynn Hutson, "Metaphor: An Evidence from Design of the Creation Model," *Creation Social Science and Humanities Quarterly*, 1:2 (Winter 1978), p.24.
- ¹²Quoted in William C. Shepherd, *Symbolic Consciousness: A Commentary on Love's Body* (Missoula, MT: Scholar's Press, 1976), p.79.
- ¹³Roszak, *The Making of a Counter Culture*, p.115.
- ¹⁴Brown, *Love's Body*, Chapters III, "Trinity," IV, "Unity," and V, "Person," pp.56-108.
- ¹⁵See Garth Wood, *The Myth of Neurosis* (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1986). According to Wood, classical Freudian psychoanalysis now costs \$90 per fifty-minute hour in New York City and demands four to five times a week except in August for five to eight years (p.89).
- ¹⁶Rousas John Rushdoony, *Freud* (Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Co., 1979), p.49.
- ¹⁷Brown, *Love's Body*, p.142, pp.160-161.
- ¹⁸Lit-sen Chang, *Zen-Existentialism* (Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed Publishing Company, 1969), p.6.
- ¹⁹ibid., p.7.
- ²⁰ibid., p.8.
- ²¹ibid., p.10.
- ²²ibid., p.33.
- ²³ibid., p.42.
- ²⁴Quoted in Rushdoony, *Freud*, p.10.
- ²⁵Chang, *Zen-Existentialism*, p.45.
- ²⁶ibid., p.133.
- ²⁷ibid., p.132.
- ²⁸ibid., pp.48-49; also cf. p.133.
- ²⁹Quoted ibid., p.147.
- ³⁰Thomas Molnar, "Oh, Benares!" in *Spiritual Counterfeits Newsletter*, Vol.11, No.2 (Summer 1985), pp.21, 22.
- ³¹Brown, *Love's Body*, p.262. The quote is taken from R. Powell, *Zen and Reality* (New York, 1962), p.72.
- ³²Brown, *Love Against Death*, p.10.
- ³³Chang, *Zen-Existentialism*, p.143.
- ³⁴Earl Ubell, "We Can Cope With Schizophrenia," *Parade Magazine*, May 18, 1986, p.20. See also Wood, *The Myth of Neurosis*, pp.215-227.
- ³⁵Brown, *Love's Body*, pp.160, 161.

GENTLEMEN

R. E. McMaster, Jr.

When Adam became irresponsible and sinned, letting Eve dominate him, at least three things occurred: (1) the covenant with God was broken; (2) lawlessness and death entered into the creation; and (3) humanism sprouted. So the second Adam, Jesus Christ, had to perfectly keep God's law, humbling Himself unto total obedience, and thus fulfill and restore the covenantal relationship between man and God. Jesus Christ was the first true gentleman. In like manner, when men are covenant keepers, obey God's law, and humble themselves under God's authority in their homes, local churches and callings, a Christian culture can take root and flourish.

A Christian culture is impossible to develop in a society which has an evolutionary rather than a creationist perspective. Creationism is the natural outworking of God's sovereignty. Evolution is the natural outworking of satanic humanism. In an evolutionary-based culture, men will either be macho, in a survival-of-the-fittest manner, or they will become wimps, dominated by women. They will not be gentlemen. Men will accordingly miss the balance of doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly with their God. ...

God's laws line up with the nature of His creation. For this reason, God assigned men tasks commensurate with their created abilities. In the Old Testament, all authority was given to the patriarch except for the execution of a member of his own family. No one had more authority in the Old Testament than the patriarch of the family. In the New Testament, the instruction in God's law, the application of God's law is assigned to men as elders in the church. The requirements of eldership for men are stiff. To be an elder a man must be tested and proven in the things of the world (Luke 16), exhibit proven broad-based maturity as a Christian man (Titus 1), and have either a proper wife or responsibility for not more than one wife. In other words, he has to be a complete gentleman.

Women seeking "equal rights" eventually exhaust themselves in head-to-head competition. In polls taken today, women confess they were better off before they were liberated. They had more respect, more leisure time, less stress. Their children, deprived of the security and love only a mother can give, enter adulthood with scars, and are motivated by unrealistic needs and unrecognized drives. ...

Just as God's plan for man is anchored in His word, of which

CSSH Quarterly
Vol. XIII, No. 1 (Fall 1990)

Jesus Christ is simultaneously the person, fulfillment and example, so too is a society anchored in the lawful obedience of men to God. Colossians 1:23 speaks of the importance of being grounded and steadfast, continuing in the faith, and not falling away from the hope of the gospel. Mark 4:17, in Jesus' parable of the soils, declares if believers have no root in themselves, they cannot endure. ...

Men are commanded to provide for, defend and instruct their families, and love them as Christ loved the church. Mature Christian men, gentlemen, being grounded and having a root in themselves, have the ability to give and serve, and exemplify the fruit of the Spirit. God's authority given to men is to be exercised with love. Without love, male authority moves toward tyranny. Leadership by inspiration sours to dictatorship by fear where love fails.

Mature Christian men, gentlemen, provide not only a protective and secure umbrella for women, but also an opportunity for them to fulfill their characteristically holistic nurturing capabilities in the home, the local church and community. Additionally, such men provide the fertile environment necessary for women to develop their economic and business talents, from whence they can finance the health, education and welfare needs of those they touch (Proverbs 31). ...

Men in the world today know little of what it means to be a gardener, to live quiet, peaceful lives of service to their families while fulfilling their calling. There are few gentlemen left. But men today are by and large not grounded; they have no root. They have no long-term anchor capable of stabilizing them or their families when the stormy winds and challenges of life come. Women accordingly suffer even more during hard times. Plus in today's world, without a Christian fatherly example or a rich marital experience, women have no frame of reference for what it means to find fulfillment in their husbands' lawful and merciful spiritual leadership and calling. Too many women have never known a gentleman. ...

Men are not by nature gentle. The concept of a "gentleman" is a Christian concept. Men become gentle when they are rooted and grounded in humble, covenantal obedience to God's law and manifest maturity by love in the fruit of the Spirit. "Gentlemen" flow inescapably from Christianity, from a broken and humbled heart and spirit unto God. It is therefore no surprise that as Christianity has degenerated in Western civilization, "gentlemen" have become more scarce.

Editor's Note: Reprinted in abridged form from *Chalcedon Report*, No. 299, June, 1990, P. O. Box 158, Vallecito, CA 95251.

WOMAN: COMPANION FOR MAN

Ellen Myers

According to the biblical creation account, as explained by Paul in 1 Corinthians 11, "the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man. Neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man. ... Nevertheless neither is the man without the woman, neither the woman without the man, in the Lord. For as the woman is of the man, even so is the man also by the woman; but all things of God.

The first fact in Scripture about the woman is that she was created for the man, to be a "help meet (or appropriate) for him." She is named "woman" because she was "taken out of man." All else—marriage, procreation, establishing and maintaining a home, providing for the family, personal companionship—follows from this fundamental reason for woman's creation out of man and for man.

No help meet for Adam was found among all the beasts. This is crucially important especially in the creation/evolution issue. This verse of Scripture (Genesis 2:21) confirms that evolutionism and biblical thought are incompatible, for it reiterates the separation between all created kinds according to Genesis 1, and especially between mankind and all other created kinds. A "help meet for Adam" could only be found by God's creation of woman out of man. This creation of woman establishes woman's full likeness to and fitness for man, and also the existence of one mankind only with only one ancestral head.

Both man and woman are fully human and the only creatures made in God's own image and likeness. Woman is in no way less human than man, the reason for and result of her direct and supernatural creation by God Himself. The biblical account of the creation of both man and woman gives us a precise epistemological account for man's and woman's equality, as evolutionists can not. Our evolutionist friends cannot even be sure that all mankind is descended from only one first pair. In fact, on evolutionist premises the simultaneous appearance of one first "fully human" male and one first "fully human" female in the same place, as required for their mating and fully human progeny, would be, pardon the word, a miracle, though evolutionists might call it chance, a mutational mega-leap (or rather, two mega-leaps) of "punctuated

equilibrium" or manifestation of the New Age cosmic divine life force. On the other hand, if evolutionists deny that all mankind descends from one first original pair, the door is opened to the racism which in fact pervaded Darwinian evolutionism for many decades.

In addition to their fundamental equality in their full humanness, man and woman are equal in that both are blessed by our Lord, and that both are charged to be fruitful, multiply, replenish and subdue the earth, and to have dominion over the rest of creation under God. This dominion mandate is addressed to the woman as well as the man, because as man's specially created appropriate helper she must of necessity participate in its exercise. One example of woman thus laboring in dominion alongside man is the history of North America. In the United States and Canada we are often reminded in historical records, stories, pictures, diaries, genealogies and also in personal reminiscences of "old-timers" of the sturdy, hard-working, brave, persevering pioneer women who accompanied their husbands and families when the great North American frontier was being opened up. These women were fulfilling their biblical creation task as helpers meet for their men. The prevalence of the biblical Christian faith among them is well documented.

Women may fulfill their duties assigned to them by God at creation apart from marriage and if married outside the home. It is the man who must take the initiative to "leave his father and mother and to cleave to his wife" as the founder and head of the home. But this fact does not release the unmarried woman from her task under God to be a help meet for man, and from her responsibility to exercise dominion over the rest of creation together with man. The difference between godly women and women ignorant of or rebellious against the biblical creation origin and purpose of woman's existence is one of attitude: the godly woman acts to serve God and man, while the ignorant or rebellious woman acts primarily to "assert" or "fulfill" herself.

The married woman may work outside the home with her husband's consent if, for example, he cannot provide for his family through no fault of his own. Another instance is the situation where homemaking takes relatively little time and where the children are grown and have left the home. Yet another instance is the newly married, as yet childless couple where both spouses work to lay aside for their future home and children. It is not right under the biblical creation view, however, to forego having children for the sake of greater wealth and comfort. Man and woman are to be fruitful, multiply, and replenish the earth, God's first command to them after creation (Genesis 1:28) which has never been repealed. Children "are

a heritage of the LORD: and the fruit of the womb is His reward," and they are a blessing from God (Psalm 127:3-4).

These principles are often lost sight of in our time where work and career opportunities for women are continuously expanding. Their usual appeal is to women's ambition and pride, or more subtly, to their desire to develop and use their talents in the service of "the community" in the abstract while omitting the crucial importance of their companionship to men in the personal sense. From this subtle diminution of the biblical view of woman it is not too far to full-fledged "women's liberation" and its rejection of companionship with men altogether. There are now many "liberated" women who see men only as business competitors, bed partners, and even as mere studs for children the women plan deliberately to raise without husbands.

The woman who is a true companion and help meet for her husband in the biblical sense is not a clinging vine whom her husband is expected to treat like a pretty, vapid, spoiled child. She is not primarily a sex object or a housekeeper, though she does not withhold herself from her spouse and does keep a good home. She takes genuine interest in him, his work, his successes and disappointments, his dreams and fears, his joys and sorrows. All this is part of the biblical sense of husband's and wife's becoming "one flesh." She counsels with her husband with all the ability and experience at her command, and with utmost, loving sensitivity towards his desires, intentions and needs so she will neither stifle his enthusiasm nor encourage him in doubtful undertakings and directions. When he does not follow her well-considered advice, she accepts his decision with good will. If it turns out that she was right and he wrong, she does not gloat. In other words, she pulls her own weight and yet shares his burdens in true obedience to Galatians 6:2-5. When she thus lives out her life as her husband's true helper, seemingly receiving no glory or favor of her own, she will be abundantly blessed, and she will never be alone. Her family will praise and bless her as with the godly woman of Proverbs 31, whose price is above rubies. Nor will she lose her own creativity but it will rather abundantly bloom and bear fruit. This is true not only of the married woman and mother, but also of the godly woman who is neither. This writer was won to Christ in part by the beautiful witness of one such dear older, single woman.

It is self-evident that men and women are not equal in physical and emotional respects, as all but the wilfully blind must admit. There are more subtle differences between them, such as men's future-directedness and women's present-directedness, men's preference for new acquisition and women's primary concern with the preservation of already acquired property. Men think in terms of overall organization or general principles, while women pay more attention to organizational

details and practical application of principles. All this shows that there is not equality, but rather a beautiful design of mutual complementarity between men and women, which witnesses to the truth of the Genesis account of their creation and purpose.

The modern women's liberation movement is obviously incompatible with the Biblical creation view of woman as man's companion. Often men themselves have contributed to the women's liberation movement, so hostile to men themselves, because they have either acted as tyrants in the home, or else allowed women to usurp the man's biblical role of headship.¹ However, with all due admission of men's part in this matter, women's liberation would overcome evil with evil. It would replace God's creation mandate for women by a godless, self-glorifying pseudo-identity for women. True companionship between men and women would be eliminated and replaced by an ugly legalism.

Leading feminists fully understand and agree with their movement's total hostility towards the biblical creation view of woman. In fact, to overthrow this biblical view is feminism's real goal. Yet feminism still defines itself by defining a woman's role in relation to man (his "equal")! However, with God out of the picture, not love and companionship but evolution's constant, lawless and pitiless struggle becomes the "norm." It is a way which leads not to love, happiness and personal fulfillment but only to conflict, hostility, loneliness, misery (who is left to befriend aging feminists?) and death. As Christ said, "What will it profit a man (or woman) if he (or she) gains the whole world, and loses his (or her) own soul?" (Mark 8:36).

The true, biblical norm for woman is to be man's companion. In defending the biblical creation view of woman by word, and more importantly, by living it, we defend the welfare of mankind, both women and men. Our welfare depends not upon "equality" but godly love.

The character of the godly man, so crucial to the woman's exercise of her biblical companionship mandate, has been discussed in this writer's article "In Praise of Men," *CSSH Quarterly*, Vol.11, No.3 (Spring 1980), pp.5-9.

BOOK REVIEWS

Mary Ann Mason, *THE EQUALITY TRAP*.
New York: Simon and Schuster, 1988.

It is often opined that imitation is the sincerest form of flattery. If true, Christians and conservatives should be extremely flattered at the way that many of our positions on marriage and family issues are being increasingly adopted by some of our most determined opponents. *The Equality Trap* by Mary Ann Mason provides an excellent example of how a number of the more benighted nostrums of the liberal left have crumpled under the harsh light of reality, to be replaced (unfortunately only partially) by a profamily viewpoint.

Ms. Mason freely admits to originally being a typical feminist. Having been educated to such values at an eastern women's college, she was an enthusiastic proponent of the feminist paradigm while teaching at a women's college in California, introducing courses in women's studies where she "was particularly enamored with the analogy between slaves and wives in the nineteenth century." She married in the egalitarian fashion, rigidly bisecting duties and responsibilities with her liberated husband, bore a child and continued her quest for self-fulfillment by pursuing her doctorate, all the while unthinkingly depositing her child at day care.

Then her bubble burst. Ms. Mason and her enlightened husband were divorced. She was forced to seek full-time work to support self and child, and she quickly discovered the real world forces a choice between lucrative, rewarding but time-consuming careers and jobs providing stable or flexible hours at more modest compensation. Choosing the former, she increasingly found herself too busy or too exhausted to meaningfully interact with her child, and slowly the dawn of a new understanding began to break:

Something has gone very wrong with the lives of women. Women are working much harder than they have worked in recent history. They are growing steadily poorer, and they are suffering the brutality of divorce at an unprecedented rate. The greatly publicized success of a very few women in high positions has created the illusion that the equal rights crusade has dramatically improved the lives of all women. The reality is that the everyday quality of women's lives has gravely deteriorated.

Touche, although a bit tardy. Our side has been saying such things for years. Now Ms. Mason has begun to sound distinctly unfeminist when she asseverates: "Equality is a trap for women."

Even the feminist holy grail of ERA is not spared as she says she now understands "the adamant opposition of most feminists of the 1920s and 1930s, like Jane Addams and Florence Howe, to the Equal Rights Amendment. They grasped the fundamental truth that modern women have lost, that women need special consideration in their role as mothers."

Ms. Mason thus evidences a most profound shift in the area of family values, demanding that "Family and children must be valued and promoted. Moral responsibility must be reintroduced into the marriage contract." Such a position represents no small ideological reversal, considering that feminist dogma typically excoriates nonworking wives as parasitical, dismisses homemaking and motherhood as suffocating, and frequently compares heterosexual marriage as prostitution.

Alas, Ms. Mason's proffered solutions have a disturbingly feminist ring. She continues to view such problems as divorce and single-parent families not in terms of individual responsibility and the need for full-time, lifelong commitment to children and spouse but as products of social forces requiring national organizations and legislated solutions.

Take for example the problem of divorce. Ms. Mason demands society (meaning taxpayers) foot the bill. She insists "publicly subsidized child care ... should be a right, not a favor," and calls for "a bill written for the needs of working women," which would guarantee, among other things, government-subsidized child care, paid maternity leaves, a higher minimum wage and re-entry rights. By removing the financial sting associated with divorce, Ms. Mason's proposal would virtually guarantee that henceforth no one would hesitate at the thought of separation. After all, Uncle Sam would pick up the tab.

Despite her rhetoric to the contrary, Ms. Mason never completely escapes the pugnacious and confrontational mindset of feminism as she calls for "an active united front of women looking out for their own best interests." Ms. Mason refers here to a united front in the literal sense as her overarching master plan for improving the lot of women involves the formation of a nationwide women's union, on the order of the AFL-CIO.

By forcing employers to deal with a collective unit, unions can indeed alter the terms of actual transactions, i.e., the level of wages for employees actually hired. What unions cannot do is alter the law of marginal productivity which governs whether or not employees are hired in the first place. Employers do not typically hire out of magnanimity but do so in the expectation that an employee's production can be sold for at least enough to cover his wages. If it cannot, the employee is causing a financial loss, an outcome most employers cannot

withstand for long. So long as union memberships are small, it is possible, if only theoretically, to benefit 100% of the union membership at the expense of marginally productive, non-union workers. However, Ms. Mason intends to unionize all working women, and unless she also intends to simultaneously improve the productivity of all working women, upward union pressure on wage levels guarantees mass unemployment for women, just as the current minimum wage has done for teens, since as Ms. Mason herself has noted, "lack of skilled training is the major reason that most women manual workers are stuck where they are."

What has all this to do with us? A fair question. To date, in our advocacy of the profamily viewpoint, it has been fairly easy to distinguish ourselves from the forces of darkness, for in their screeching for abortion, no-fault divorce, subsidized day care, comparable worth, etc., etc. ad nauseam, feminists have not pretended to be even remotely profamily about anything. However, with the advent of neo-feminists such as Mary Ann Mason, all this has changed. Our task has become considerably more difficult in that feminist solutions are now being seriously proposed for profamily reasons.

I know this may sound a bit alarmist, but I challenge anyone to check out the recent issues of popular magazines and read about the "New Traditionalist" moms to verify that I'm not making this up. This is a case where, if we are not diligent, we will find the rug pulled out from under us by feminist advocates who insist: "But we are trying to help families!"

—Reviewed by Jim Farthing

Maggie Gallagher, ***Enemies of Eros***. Chicago, IL:
Bonus Books, Inc., 160 East Illinois Street, 1989.
Hardcover, 283 pp. incl. Index. \$18.95 ppd.

Maggie Gallagher graduated from Yale University and was formerly Article Editor for *National Review*. George Gilder says that *Enemies of Eros* is the "best book ever written on marriage and divorce—man or woman, ignore it at your peril." Judge Robert H. Bork, whose candidacy for the U. S. Supreme Court abortionists and feminists succeeded in destroying, comments: "Gallagher demonstrates that our new right-think—that there are no important differences between male and female—has proved disastrous to families and, most especially, to women."

Enemies of Eros is a devastating attack on modern feminism. Its sarcastic gallows humor alternates with righteous, passionate anger over the well documented results of the sexual revolution

In general and feminist fanaticism in particular. Gallagher's thesis is that most women, today as throughout history, place their family's needs above their careers away from home; that our culture has adopted the feminist myth of total sexual equality; and that our whole society, beginning with women themselves, pays for this distortion of reality in enormous suffering. Our very survival is at stake:

And all the while women are getting poorer, more exposed, more often beaten and abused, as the fabric of our family life ... unravels. Our children are fewer in number, too few now even to replace the population. Those that remain are more often battered, beaten, neglected, isolated, sexually used, or simply ignored. ... The cycle repeats, spiralling progressively downward, all because of our determined ignorance of a few basic facts of life. ...

A society which tries to reduce sex to its pleasures, to cut off gender from sex, sex from Eros, Eros from children, cuts itself and its people off from the resources we need to survive and to triumph. For these are the bonds by which our fathers and mothers bequeathed our present pleasures to us. These are the only bonds strong enough to build a future which our children may enjoy. (pp.270-271)

A few highlights of Gallagher's thoroughly researched and brilliantly presented path to this conclusion include her description of the feminist "boogey woman," the "Devouring Housewife" modeled more or less slanderously after the feminists' own hated and despised mothers. Together with this distorted picture of the homemaker and stay-at-home mother goes the propaganda that motherhood is a trap. This lie "was invented, as it were, to give a rationale for reshaping our social institutions so that women could not safely choose family over career" (p.58).

A related lie whose results we see all around us in public school textbooks, the media, advertising and government tax policy is that the work women do at home is really superfluous. Mothering has a very low social status. Gallagher comments: "I think women remain family centered because we understand, even if the culture does not, that the work we do for our families is not superfluous at all. I think that the energy women put into their families is indispensable; the crime is that the work we do is so little acknowledged or respected, even among women" (p.65).

Gallagher cites recent statistics to show that societies deprecating motherhood commit literal suicide:

America's fertility rate has now fallen to about 1.8 births per woman, well below the 2.1 replacement level. On

Jan. 31, 1989, the Census Bureau projected that the U.S. population will peak in 2038, and decline thereafter. My son, currently six, may well live to see a rapidly depopulated United States. If you have ever lived in an area with a declining population, you know that is not a pleasant prospect. ...

America will begin to feel the effects soon, when the children who failed to be born in the late sixties and early seventies, fail to mature in the mid-nineties, precipitating both a labor, and eventually a consumer shortage (and depleting Social Security funds). In West Germany ... only 10 percent of post-war married couples believe that children are more important than consumer goods or careers ... By the end of the next century, if current trends continue, West Germany's population will dwindle from 61 million to 20 million; achieving, at last, a ghostly Lebensraum. (pp.82-83)

Of course, what may well happen instead in the United States if the Lord tarries is a surge of Latin American immigrants, and in West Germany (as well as other child-poor, aging Western European countries) the increasing immigration and eventual takeover by Muslim "guest workers" from the near East and Africa. There will also be an increasing push for euthanasia for the aged, already semi-officially and widely practiced in Holland. This is the just penalty upon societies disregarding God's creation mandate to be fruitful, multiply, replenish the earth, and have dominion over it (Genesis 1:26). Gallagher, who does not write from the biblical Christian perspective, does not draw this conclusion.

Young parents contemplating the mother's return to work outside the home need to ponder the chapter on "Day Care and the Disposable Mother." Gallagher, an unmarried mother compelled to work, cites a study finding "what hundreds of social workers refused to: the pain, loneliness, confusion, and boredom of many toddlers in group day care. I have put my own son in four different day care centers in three different states, and I cannot disagree" (p.99). Higher infection and sickness rates are linked to group day care; long term psychological effects may be very harmful. Gallagher recommends child care by relatives, friends and neighbors, "though what the next generation is going to do, with hardly any siblings, and mothers, aunts and grandmothers all working full-time is anyone's guess" (p.101).

One persistent feminist myth is the creation of the "new man," so gentle and nurturing that he can replace the mother. He has not been created; on the contrary, men evade their marital and paternal responsibilities more than ever, aided and abetted by the new "no-fault" divorce laws in most states.

As Gallagher writes, "Both married and absent fathers must be made to meet their responsibilities to their children. But that will never happen as long as the creators of taboo remain more appalled at the idea of gender, than they are by the increasing poverty of women and the anguished bewilderment of children abandoned by their fathers" (p.126). Gallagher obviously believes that cultural pressure will restore men to healthy marriage and fatherhood. This is the typical "decent non-Christian" delusion. God the Creator and Lord's mercy and grace through His prophets according to His Law is needed to "turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to their fathers" (Malachi 4:6), especially when a society has broken down as much as ours today.

Because Gallagher does not write as a biblical Christian and hence cannot refer to biblical creation as the foundation for man's nature, her chapter on sex roles ("The Search for the Secret Self") gets hung up on a critique of sociobiology and the old nature-versus-nurture arguments, without offering solutions. The same critique applies to the basic thrust of the book's section on "Sex and Justice," which discusses the feminist attempt to base the family on legal contract rather than "status." Without the biblical creation foundation, the argument for the family's supposed status established by nature is unconvincing. After all, if creation is false, then we got here by evolution; and what is then more clear than that nature changes, and man and his institutions with it? Nevertheless, this section is an excellent source of what marital instability and skyrocketing divorce have done to our society in general and to women and children in particular.

The endnotes after each chapter are well worth reading and full of useful information. Gallagher's absolute opposition to abortion deserves special commendation, as does her excellent discussion of surrogate motherhood and the "Baby M" case.

Recommended as an excellent source of information on what the feminist mentality has done to our society, in particular to women whom it claimed to "liberate."

—Reviewed by Ellen Myers

MOTHERHOOD AND CREATION

Cardinal Josef Mindszenty

"The most important person on earth is a mother. She cannot claim the honor of having built Notre Dame Cathedral. She need not. She has built something more magnificent than any cathedral—a dwelling for an immortal soul, the tiny perfection of her baby's body. ... The angels have not been blessed with such a grace. They cannot share in God's creative miracle to bring new saints to Heaven. Only a human mother can. Mothers are closer to God the Creator than any other human creature. God joins forces with mothers in performing this act of creation ... What on God's earth is more glorious than this: to be a mother."

Quoted by Fr. Paul Marx in *Human Life International* letter to supporters.

Index to Volumes XI and XII of the CSSH Quarterly

Vol. XI, No. 1 (Fall 1988)

- Colson, Charles with Ellen Santilli Vaughn: Kingdoms in Conflict (Book Review)
Grant, George: The Dispossessed: Homelessness in America (Book Review)
Myers, Ellen: Inconsistencies in "Enlightened" Autonomous Thought
Myers, Ellen: The Story of Paul Kammerer, or, Is Lamarckism Dead?
Rusch, Wilbert H., Sr., and John W. Klotz: Did Charles Darwin become a Christian? (Book Review)
Sauer, James L.: The Babylonian Captivity of the Word
Vorfeld, J. C.: Parable: The New Age Creates Perfect God
Index to Volumes IX and X of the CSSH Quarterly

Vol. XI, No. 2 (Winter 1988)

- Berg, Viola Jacobson: Poetry
Billingsley, Lloyd: The Generation That Knew Not Joseph (Book Review)
Hunt, Dave: Beyond Seduction: A Return to Biblical Christianity (Book Review)
Myers, Ellen: Christian Scholar Extraordinary: The Work of Wilhelm Schmidt
Schmidt, Wilhelm: The Origin and Development of Property
Schmidt, Wilhelm: The Creation Account of the Earliest Time in the Bible and in Ethnology
CSSHQ Quote File: Quotable Quotes from Past Issues
Tenbrink, Mary: Poetry

Vol. XI, No. 3 (Spring 1990)

- Bellarmino, Cardinal: The Galileo Affair: Letter to Father Foscarini
Braun, Marcus R.: The Need for Scholarly Christian Philosophy
Cook, Charles: Creation and Biblical Accuracy
Impson, Beth: Creation Scientists: A Non-Scientist's Observations
Myers, Ellen: When Were the Original Gospels Written?
Schmemmann, Alexander: The Eucharist (Special Easter Book Review)
Scott, Otto J.: Galileo Revisited

Vol. XI, No. 4 (Summer 1989)

- Ancil, Ralph E.: Inconsistencies in Evolutionary Environmentalist

Thought

Berg, Viola Jacobson: Poetry

Buehrer, Eric: Terminal Vision

Myers, Ellen: New Ethics Programs in Public Schools

Myers, Ellen: Origins Teaching in Public Schools

Powell, Diane: The Province of Science

Sauer, James L.: Patriarch of the Permanent Things: Edmund Burke as Christian Literary Mentor

Vol. XII, No. 1 (Fall 1989)

Myers, Ellen: Biblical Creation and Society, A Study Course, Part I

Creation, the Foundation of the Biblical World View; Philosophy, Ethics; Evolutionism; The New Age Movement; Psychology, Counseling and Selfism; Economics; Poor Relief; Man's Creativity; Science

Vol. XII, No. 2 (Winter 1989)

Myers, Ellen: Biblical Creation and Society, A Study Course, Part II

Man's Creativity: Literature, Music, Fine Arts; Abortion; Euthanasia; Population Control; The Family; Education; The State; Final Review and Conclusion; Selected Bibliography

Vol. XII, No. 3 (Spring 1990)

Berg, Viola Jacobson: Poetry

Berthoud, Jean-Marc: The Lawless State, the Impotent Church

Conn, Harry: Liberty on the Line: Precious Freedom Threatened (Editorial)

Huffington, Adrianna Stassinopoulos: Picasso (Book Review)

Luscher, Henri: If You Are the Son of God, Come Down from the Cross

Myers, Ellen: Christians in Authority

Sharpe, J. Shelby: The Coming Nuclear Attack on Christianity in America

Vol. XII, No. 4 (Summer 1990)

Ancil, Ralph E.: Man and His Environment: The Creationist Perspective

Berg, Viola Jacobson: Poetry

Coleson, Edward: Truth and the Christian Teacher

Haigh, Paula: Proofs for the Existence of God: A Catholic View

McMaster, R. E.: Talk to the Animals

Myers, Ellen: Creation and Worship (Devotional)

Myers, Ellen: Creation and Proof for the Existence of God

Creation Science Dialogue: Training Park Interpreters: Some Guests Are Less Welcome Than Others

Request to CSSHQ Readers:

In my former letters I have submitted a list of Biblical creationist titles for your kind consideration. The following are among them:

- (1) What is Creation Science?
- (2) Unlocking the Mysteries of Creation
- (3) It Could not Just Happen!
- (4) Incredible Life: A Handbook of Biological Mysteries
- (5) More About my Magnificent Machine
- (6) My Magnificent Machine
- (7) The New Age Movement (by Ellen Myers)
- (8) The Remarkable Spaceship Earth.

Please forward them through sea-mail. Even though it takes some 4 months to reach here, sea mail saves much postal charge.

Meanwhile our Library activities are flourishing. In order to avoid the allegations of a bias towards creationism, we have collected some anti-creationist books also. Nonbelievers can attack anything related to the Bible as "fundamentalist." We are tactfully escaping from such stamping. But our creationist evangelism through the Library ministry really works!

I have personally arranged a one day programme (main speaker: Indian creationist Mr. A. K. Skariah, Kottayam) at Chavara Cultural Centre, Evnakulam on May 11, 1990. It is expected that this will attract hundreds of youths. The subject under discussion will be Origin of Life, Genetic Code and Information Science, Origin and Destiny of Life. At present there will not be any theological discussion. I shall inform you of the aftereffects of the programme.

When the Indian Science Congress was held in Cochin, we distributed some reprints of ICR articles (1,000 copies). It is expected to have a great impact. Please pray.

Yours sincerely,

V. A. M. Ashrof, Librarian
Thinker's Library
Valiyaveetil
Edavanakad, Kerala
India 682 502

Editor's Note: We beg our readers to send any or all the above listed books to Mr. Ashrof, if possible. Second-hand used copies welcome.

Clip and mail to:

CREATION SOCIAL SCIENCE
AND HUMANITIES SOCIETY
1429 N. Holyoke
Wichita, Kansas 67208

- ☐ Enclosed is my payment of \$12* for Sustaining Membership dues. I subscribe to the Creation Social Science and Humanities Society's *Statement of Belief*.
1. The Bible is the written Word of God. It is inspired and inerrant throughout. Its assertions are historically and scientifically true in all the original autographs. To the student of the social sciences and humanities this means that the account of origins in Genesis is a factual presentation of simple historical truths.
 2. All basic types of living things, including man, were made by direct creative acts of God during the Creation Week described in Genesis. Whatever biological changes have occurred since Creation Week have accomplished only changes within the original created kinds.
 3. The great Flood described in Genesis, commonly referred to as the Noachian Flood, was an historic event worldwide in its extent and effect.
 4. We are an organization of Christian men and women who accept Jesus Christ as our Lord and Saviour. The account of the special creation of Adam and Eve as one man and woman in the image of God and their subsequent fall into sin is the basis for our belief in the necessity of a Saviour for all mankind. Therefore, salvation can come only through accepting Jesus Christ as our Saviour.

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ ZIP _____

*(\$13 U.S. if you reside outside the USA).

- ☐ Enclosed is non-member subscription fee of \$14 (foreign, \$15 U.S.) for one year's subscription to the **CSSHS Quarterly**.

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ ZIP _____

DEVOTIONAL: GOD'S ANSWER TO DISCOURAGEMENT	page 1
J. Dwight Pentecost	
LETTER	page 2
MISSION TO MOSCOW 1990: THE GROUNDWORK	page 3
Ellen Myers	
ANNOUNCEMENT	page 6
FORERUNNER OF NEW AGE MADNESS: A CRITIQUE OF NORMAN O. BROWN	page 7
Ellen Myers	
GENTLEMEN	page 17
R.E. McMaster, Jr.	
WOMAN: COMPANION FOR MAN	page 19
Ellen Myers	
BOOK REVIEWS	page 23
CREATION AND MOTHERHOOD	page 29
Cardinal Josef Mindszenty	
INDEX TO VOLUMES XI & XII OF THE CSSH QUARTERLY	page 30
REQUEST TO CSSHQ READERS	page 32

Creation Social Science
& Humanities Society
1429 N. Holyoke (316) 683-3610
Wichita, Kansas 67208

Non-Profit Org. U.S. Postage PAID Wichita, Kansas Permit No. 929
--

MO ASSN FOR CREATION
405 N SAPPINGTON RD
GLENDALE

MO 63122